



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Ho Keung, Tse.  
Filing Date : 12/01/95  
Examiner : Laufer, P

Application Number : 08/ 587, 448  
Group Art Unit : 3642

P.O. Box 54670,  
North Point Post Office,  
Hong Kong.

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231,  
Box AF.

Sir,

**Whether Argument Dii in Appeal Brief(Substitute)**  
**is necessary ?**

Although there has no rejection under section 101 in the final office action, it is necessary to have argument Dii, entitled "Whether material X is capable of being used for protecting software" in the Appeal Brief(substitute). For the reason that, in the final office action, P.2, item 2b, the Examiner incorrectly interpret the claimed invention as a software method, or computer apparatus, and it appears that the Examiner merely interpretes material X[for its definition, pls refer to the Appeal Brief(substitute), item Di] as for providing identity information of a user for causing operation for which that user has to responsible, and nothing more. Actually, the present invention as defined by the claims is a material and in which material X is being used for protecting software, for details please refer to argument Dii.

Should the Examiner has already accepted that, or after reading Dii, accept that material X is capable of being used for protecting software, please indicate this in the Examiner Answer so that the Board of Appeals can ignore argument Dii.

With regards,

Date: June, 29, 98

Name of Inventor and Applicant :

Ho Keung, Tse.

RECEIVED  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600  
98 JUL 13 PM 2:32

AT/6W 3642  
36 Amdt I  
Appeal Brief  
(3)  
Coper  
7-5-98